CORRIHER, SUSAN ELAINE. Three Techniques for Teaching Behavior Principles to Kindergarten Children. (1974) Directed by: Donald G. Wildemann. Pp. 57.

Modeling, verbal training, and a combination of modeling and verbal training were compared to a no-treatment control group to determine which method was most effective in teaching behavior principles to kindergarten children. The principles taught were verbal punishment followed by extinction for inappropriate aggressive behaviors and inappropriate nonaggressive behaviors and reinforcement for appropriate behaviors. Subjects were four- and five-year-old kindergarten children.

The results of this study indicated that all three of the training techniques were effective methods of teaching the principles to kindergarten children. The methods, however, did not differ from one another in effectiveness. Separate analyses performed on the responses to each of three behavior categories suggested differential effectiveness for the three techniques. Responses to the appropriate category were not modified by any of the treatment procedures. Lack of significance in this category may be accounted for by the fact that subjects in this study approached a ceiling effect on the pretest assessment. The analysis performed on responses to the inappropriate nonaggressive behavior sequences reflected the overall results: all three treatment procedures were

effective in increasing the number of correct responses to these sequences and not one procedure differed from any other in its effectiveness. Only the modeling and the combination of modeling and verbal training were effective in modifying responses to the inappropriate aggressive behavior sequences. Implications of these results were discussed in terms of utilizing peers as "therapists" for a child's problem behavior in a group setting. In addition, areas of concern for future research were discussed.

THREE TECHNIQUES FOR TEACHING BEHAVIOR PRINCIPLES TO KINDERGARTEN CHILDREN

by

Susan Elaine Corriher

A Thesis Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Greensboro
1974

Approved by

Donald S. Wilderman
Thesis Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This thesis has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Thesis Adviser Donald R. Wilderman

Committee Members Marilyn T. Erickson

Robert M. Pratt

April 22, 1974
Date of Acceptance by Committee

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to the following people and agencies for their cooperation and assistance in preparing this manuscript: To Dr. Donald G. Wildemann for his contributions to the final design of this study, for hours spent in perfecting the video tape sequences and for his critical comments on earlier drafts of this manuscript; to Dr. Marilyn T. Erickson for her assistance in preparing the preliminary proposal and for her feedback concerning the text of the thesis; to Dr. Robin Pratt for his helpful comments concerning the statistical design of this study; to Dr. P. Scott Lawrence for the loan of his video-tape equipment during the filming and actual running of the thesis; to Elaine Talbert, another graduate student at UNC-G for her help in filming the video-tape sequences; to Chris Crane and Ken Wein for their excellent performances in the puppet films; to all the kindergarten children attending the Experimental Kindergarten in the Spring of 1973 for their wonderful performances in all behavior sequences utilized in the thesis; to the Gingerbread House for their assistance in obtaining subjects and for providing a place to run the thesis; to the Carter Day Care Center for their assistance

in obtaining subjects; to David Sheslow for his critical reading of the manuscript; to my mother and father; and to friends who offered their moral support during all phases of preparation of this manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

APPENDIX

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The behavioral approach to the treatment of maladaptive behavior focuses on the relationship between the behavior and the environment in which it occurs. The approach assumes that within the natural environment, contingencies exist which serve to maintain the maladaptive behavior. Treatment techniques, therefore, tend to be implemented in the environment where the maladaptive behavior occurs. One efficient use of behavioral techniques in the natural environment is to train those persons in the environment who already maintain some degree of control over the individual. This procedure is especially effective in treating a child's maladaptive behavior in the home. Parents not only have a great deal of contact with the child but are often the most powerful source of reinforcement for the child. In the school situation, teachers become obvious candidates for applying behavioral techniques to maladaptive behavior in the classroom. Indeed, numerous studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of utilizing parents and teachers as therapists for children's maladaptive behaviors.

Becker, Madsen, Arnold and Thomas (1967) trained teachers to selectively attend to appropriate behaviors and

to ignore inappropriate behaviors in their classrooms. General rules in classroom management were given to the teachers as well as specific instructions for particular target children. Seminars were also held with the teachers to discuss and practice the techniques. Although difficulties were encountered, teachers were effective in reducing the deviant behaviors of children in their classrooms.

Hali, Panyan, Rabon and Broden (1968) investigated the effectiveness of training beginning teachers in the use of behavior principles. Three first grade teachers having difficulty in obtaining and maintaining control in the classroom were employed as "therapists." Target behaviors were increases in studying quietly and decreases in talking out without permission. All three teachers successfully increased study behaviors and decreased disruption and noise in the classroom. The authors pointed out that the procedures were carried out within the regular classroom, utilizing reinforcers intrinsic to the classroom situation. Therefore, these techniques should be relevant for any teacher experiencing difficulty in controlling inappropriate behaviors within the classroom.

A later study by Hall, Fox, Willard, Goldsmith, Emerson, Owen, Davis and Porcia (1971) indicated that teachers could effectively observe and manipulate

contingencies within their classrooms without the help of an outside observer or experimenter. In each of these experiments, the target behavior was talking in class without permission. The teachers were students in the senior author's class on classroom management. The exact information and training that the teachers received were not specified. In each study, the teacher was able to observe and effectively reduce talking without permission. An important aspect of these studies was the fact that the teachers carried out research within the context of normal teaching activities as they modified behavior problems in their classrooms.

Wahler, Windel, Peterson and Morrison (1965) examined the use of parents as therapeutic agents for the problem behaviors of their own children.

> "Most psychotherapists assume that a child's parents compose the most influential part of his natural environment. It is likely from a learning theory viewpoint, that their behaviors serve a large variety of stimulus functions, controlling both the respondent and operant behaviors of their children. It then follows that if some of the child's behavior is considered to be deviant at a particular time in his early years, his parents are probably the source of eliciting stimuli and reinforcers which have produced and are currently maintaining this behavior. A logical procedure for the modification of the child's deviant behavior would involve changing the parent's behavior. These changes would be aimed at training them both to eliminate the contingencies which currently support their child's deviant behavior, and to provide new contingencies to produce and maintain more normal behaviors which would compete with the deviant behavior" (p. 114).

Wahler et al. trained mothers to extinguish the deviant behavior of their children and to reinforce appropriate behaviors. Prior to training, experienced observers classified deviant and appropriate behaviors of the child and responses to these behaviors by the mother. These data were explained to the mothers. Instructions were given to ignore the deviant behaviors and to respond warmly to appropriate behaviors. A signal light initially cued each mother when to respond and later served as reinforcement for appropriate responding on her part. Utilizing behavior principles, each mother was able to reduce inappropriate behaviors and increase appropriate behaviors. The authors noted that all training sessions were carried out in the clinic playroom and therefore, generalization of changes in the child's behavior would be dependent on the ability of the mother to modify behavior outside of the experimental situation.

A more efficient use of parents as therapists might be to conduct treatment in the home environment. Hawkins, Schweild and Bijou (1966) investigated this possibility in the treatment of a four-year-old boy whose deviant behaviors included tantrums, removing or tearing his clothing and aggression toward other individuals. Experimental therapy sessions were conducted twice a week in the home. The mother was taught to recognize objectionable behaviors and to modify these behaviors by

using verbal instructions, time out and reinforcement. During therapy sessions, a trained observer used gestural signals to cue an appropriate response from the mother. With cueing, the mother was able to eliminate the objectionable behaviors. All phases of therapy were conducted in the home environment. Seilberber, Sampen and Sloan (1968) used a similar procedure with parents as therapists for their disobedient, aggressive four-and-one-half-year-old boy. Manipulation of contingencies through the use of extinction, time out and reinforcement clearly reduced aggressive and disobedient behaviors. Both studies indicate that treatment of behavior problems can be carried out in the home with parents in the role of therapists.

Hall, Axelrod, Tyler, Grief, Jones and Robertson (1972) investigated the use of parents as primary observers and experimenters in the home environment without the aid of an outsider. Target behaviors included wearing an orthodontic device, helping with routine household tasks, whining and shouting, and taking an excessively long time to dress. During a course in "Responsive Teaching" parents were trained to design appropriate behavior intervention plans and to record and measure data. The parents were responsible for observation, data collection, and implementation of behavior modification techniques in their own home. The parents reported that all behavior problems

were significantly reduced.

The above examples are only a few of the many studies employing parents as therapists for their own children. Research has borne out the efficacy of this procedure. A major advantage to using the parent as therapist is the simultaneous change in the behaviors of the parent and in the behaviors of the child. A further advantage is the potential for continuous treatment carried out in the absence of professional therapists. Parents also become more skilled in handling behavior difficulties of the child in the context of normal events of family living.

A more thorough examination of a child's natural environment reveals another group of "natural therapists," the child's own peers. O'Leary and O'Leary (1972) reported that peer influence has been utilized by psychologists and teachers in three ways: (a) a child's peers are reinforced for appropriate behavior with the expectation that the target child will model the appropriate behavior, (b) a child's peers are reinforced contingent upon the appropriate behavior of the target child, and (c) a child's peers are used as observers and recorders of the target behavior and as dispensers of reinforcement for appropriate behaviors. Several studies have investigated the effectiveness of utilizing peers in the treatment of a child's maladaptive behavior.

Carlson, Arnold, Becker and Madsen (1968) used a

combination of punishment of temper tantrums and reinforcement of the class for ignoring the tantrums. In addition, the child was given a star for each half day without tantrums. Four stars earned the class a party. Manipulation of peer contingencies and group reinforcement for "non-tantrumming" in combination with a time out procedure for tantrums effectively reduced the number of tantrums.

Barrish, Saunders and Wolf (1969) devised a "good behavior game" in which consequences of a child's behavior were shared by other children in the classroom. The room was divided into teams. Target behaviors were being out-of-seat and talking out. Either of these behaviors resulted in a mark being placed on the blackboard for that child's team. The team with the least number of chalk marks earned extra privileges. Introduction of the good behavior game significantly reduced disruptive behavior.

Surratt, Ulrich and Hawkins (1969) also employed school children as "natural therapists." The target behavior was the studying behavior of four first-grade children. Surratt et al. reasoned that in a classroom situation, the people most available for the modification of behavior problems of a particular student are other students. The "therapist" in this situation was a fifth-grade student. Control was accomplished through the use

of an apparatus designed to record behavior and give feedback as to whether the individual was meeting criterion. The fifth grader was trained to reinforce appropriate study behavior in each of the target children. The fifth grader was successful in increasing the amount of quiet studying in each of the four first graders. In addition, the fifth grader's teacher was able to use the student's participation in the experiment as reinforcement for her academic achievement.

A study by Whalen and Hanker (1969) dramatically demonstrated the effective use of behavior modification principles by nonprofessionals. The nonprofessional therapists were mentally retarded adolescents who served as tutors for younger retardates. The average Mental Age for the adolescent tutors was 9.6 years, while the average Mental Age for the retarded trainees was 2.1 years. The training procedure for the tutors involved modeling and reinforcement. The tutor first observed the therapist teaching a patient to imitate. The tutor then practiced the technique while the experimenter provided feedback, suggestions for improvement and further demonstrations if necessary. Tokens and social praise were dispensed for adequate therapist performance. Supervision was gradually faded to increase the tutor's responsibility for the training of the younger retardates. The results showed that moderately retarded patients could learn to effectively

modify the behavior of other retardates with minimal supervision.

Previous research, therefore, has demonstrated that children are important dispensers of social reinforcement and that behavior problems of a child may be maintained by reinforcement from his peers. This research has also demonstrated that elimination of peer attention to a deviant behavior significantly decreases such behavior. Training children to apply the behavior modification techniques of reinforcement and extinction should increase their effectiveness as social reinforcers and therefore, increase their potential as "natural therapists" for children emitting deviant behaviors in a group setting. In addition, this training would provide each child with a more effective means of dealing with individuals within his environment.

The present study is designed to compare the effectiveness of three training methods, each designed to teach kindergarten children how to apply the principle of verbal punishment followed by extinction to inappropriate behaviors of their peers and how to apply the principle of reinforcement to appropriate behaviors of their peers. The training methods included: (a) modeling the correct contingencies, (b) verbal training of the correct contingencies and (c) a combination of modeling and verbal training. The study examined the effectiveness of each

of these methods in training children to apply correct contingencies to three categories of behaviors: (a) inappropriate-aggressive, (b) inappropriate-non-aggressive and (c) appropriate behavior. Since modeling was one of the training procedures employed, training was conducted with a video tape system. Thus, the present study had the dual goals of teaching children how to apply appropriate contingencies to the behaviors of their peers and of comparing the effectiveness of three training procedures.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects (Ss) were 40 four- and five-year-old children. The Ss were enrolled in two privately owned and operated commercial kindergartens in the Greensboro, North Carolina, area. Subjects manifested no specific behavior problems or physical abnormalities. Subjects were matched according to age and sex and randomly assigned to one of four experimental conditions.

Apparatus

All training and testing was done with the aid of video tape equipment consisting of a Panasonic video tape recorder (Panasonic Model NV-8100 D) and a television monitor (Panasonic Model AN-69 V).

In addition, a 48 x 22 inch response panel was used during the pre- and post- test. Attached to the plywood response panel was a 48 x 13 inch section of clear plastic divided into four picture holders each 9 1/2 x 11 1/2 inches. An 11 x 7 inch colored line drawing, representing one of the four response choices, could be inserted into each holder. A Christmas-tree light bulb was located directly beneath each holder. The light could be lit by a push button switch mounted below each light. Ss

indicated their response choice on each trial by pressing one of the four buttons, causing the bulb under the picture to light.

Video tapes

The children who performed the pre- and post- test sequences and served as models in the modeling sequences were four- and five-year-old children enrolled in the Experimental Kindergarten at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. All children were familiar to the author prior to the video taping situation. The children were told that they were participating in making television tapes that would help other children learn what to do when their peers emitted appropriate and inappropriate behaviors. As the children filmed each sequence, it was pointed out to them whether the behavior they were acting out was appropriate or inappropriate. During the filming of the modeling sequences, the appropriate contingencies were explained to each child. These children received no special training in performing before a television camera.

Procedure

Pre- and Post- Test. The pre- and post- tests for all Ss were identical in content and procedure. The pretest was administered to each S individually, one day prior to treatment. The posttest was administered immediately following the treatment procedure. In both pre- and post-

test conditions, Ss were shown 27 video-taped sequences of behaviors. The sequences consisted of three types of behaviors presented in a random order: (a) nine appropriate behaviors, (b) nine inappropriate aggressive behaviors and (c) nine inappropriate nonaggressive behaviors. Appendix A lists each of the behavioral sequences employed in the pre- and post- tests. Prior to seeing the video-taped sequences, Ss were given a brief description of the response alternatives. As a picture of a possible response choice was inserted into a holder on the response panel, the experimenter (E) both described the picture to the child and pushed the button under that picture, causing the bulb to light. Prior to the presentation of the pretest, the E questioned the child to ensure that the child understood what was required of him. The pretest sequences were presented only after the E was reasonably certain that the S understood the task requirements. After viewing each video-taped sequence of behavior, the E verbally described the sequence. The S could choose one of four possible response choices: (a) telling the teacher, (b) saying "That's not nice" and walking away, (c) hitting and (d) smiling and being friendly (see Appendix B for pictures of the response choices). The order of presentation of response choices for each sequence was randomly varied to control for any possible ordering effects. The same procedure was employed for all 27

behavior sequences. As the S responded, the E recorded his answer. Total viewing time for all Ss was equated for all conditions.

Treatment Conditions

Modeling with Principles Group. Subjects in the Modeling with Principles group were shown a seven-minute video-taped dialogue between a puppet and an adult (see Appendix C). The content of the puppet's dialogue was designed to teach two behavior principles: (a) verbal punishment followed by extinction of inappropriate behavior and (b) reinforcing appropriate behavior. The language of the dialogue was at a level consistent with the speech of kindergarten children and contained repetition of the principles with frequent examples.

After watching the Principles dialogue, Ss were shown 30 filmed sequences of appropriate, inappropriate nonaggressive and inappropriate aggressive behaviors. Each behavioral sequence was followed by a video-taped presentation of a child modeling the correct consequences. These filmed sequences were similar to the sequences in the pretest (see Appendix D). After the S viewed the filmed consequences, the E described what the model did.

Principles Only Group. Subjects in the Principles Only Group also were shown the seven-minute dialogue between the puppet and the adult followed by the 30 behavior sequences. These Ss, however, did not see the

modeling sequences. Instead, each sequence was repeated and Ss were instructed to think about the principles in the dialogue as they watched the sequences.

Modeling Only Group. Subjects in the Modeling Only Group were also shown a dialogue between the puppet and the adult. Appropriate and inappropriate behaviors were mentioned. However, no behavior principles were discussed and examples of correct consequation were omitted. The dialogue, therefore, was irrelevant to training (see Appendix E). Subjects were then shown the 30 behavior sequences followed by the appropriate modeled consequences. Subjects were instructed to watch boys and girls who knew what to do when other children behaved appropriately or inappropriately. After the S observed the filmed consequences, the E described what the model did.

No-Treatment Control Group. Subjects in the No-Treatment Control Group saw the seven-minute irrelevant conversation followed by the 30 behavior sequences. These behavior sequences were repeated as in the Principles Only Group. Instructions to Ss in the No-Treatment Control Group were to think about what they would do if this happened to them.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The number correct on the pretest and posttest were computed for each S. Only one of the four response choices was designated as correct for each behavioral category: (a) for appropriate behaviors, smiling and being friendly (i.e., reinforcement) was the correct response, (b) for inappropriate aggressive behaviors, saying "That's not nice" and walking away (i.e., verbal punishment followed by extinction) was the correct response and (c) for inappropriate but nonaggressive behaviors, saying "That's not nice" and walking away (i.e., verbal punishment followed by extinction) was the correct response.

As Table 1 indicates, the random assignment of Ss to conditions resulted in a biased pretest score for the Modeling with Principles Group. The mean pretest score for this group ($\bar{X}$=8.9, range 5-11) was significantly lower than the pretest scores for the Principles Group ($\bar{X}$=12.1, range 3-18), the Modeling Group ($\bar{X}$=12.4, range 9-19) and the Control Group ($\bar{X}$=12.2, range 12-15). To control for these initial differences, an analysis of covariance was performed on the change scores. Change scores were computed for each S by subtracting the number correct on the pretest from the

number correct on the posttest (see Table 2). This analysis revealed a significant main effect for treatments [$F(3,35)=6.16$, $p<0.05$].

TABLE 1

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Each Training Procedure on the Pretest and Posttest

	Pretest		Posttest	
Training Procedure	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Modeling with Principles	8.9	2.48	18.3	4.29
Modeling	12.4	3.12	18.3	5.07
Principles	12.1	4.25	16.4	4.15
Control	12.2	1.47	12.7	2.19

TABLE 2

Mean Change Scores and Standard Deviations for Each Training Procedure

	Change Score	
Training Procedure	Mean	S.D.
Modeling with Principles	9.4	5.16
Modeling	5.9	4.69
Principles	4.3	2.49
Control	0.5	2.16

In order to assess the differential effectiveness of each treatment procedure, a Newman-Keuls *post hoc* statistic was performed on mean change scores, adjusted to control

for initial differences in mean pretest scores (see Table 3). The results of this analysis indicated that the Modeling with Principles Group, the Modeling Group and the Principles Group each differed significantly from the No-Treatment Control Group ($p<0.05$) at the .05 level of significance. However, only the Modeling with Principles Group differed significantly from the No-Treatment Control Group at the .01 level of significance. The Modeling with Principles, Modeling and Principles groups did not differ from each other. Thus, all three treatment approaches were effective in teaching behavior modification to children and no technique was superior in its effectiveness.

TABLE 3

Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis for the Overall Change Scores

Groups:	Control	Prin.	Model.	Model-Prin.	r	Critical Value	
Means:	.53	4.59	6.31	8.37		.05	.01
	-	4.06*	5.78**	7.84**	4	6.08	4.89
	-	-	1.72	3.78	3	5.64	4.42
	-	-	-	2.06	2	4.94	3.68
	-	-	-	-			

*$p<.05$
**$p<.01$

In order to determine the extent to which changes in each behavior category contributed to this overall change

score, further analyses were performed on the responses within each behavioral category. As Table 4 shows, the mean pretest score for the appropriate behavior sequences was significantly higher in each group than the mean pretest scores for the inappropriate aggressive behavior sequences and the inappropriate nonaggressive behavior sequences. Analyses of covariance were employed to control for these pretest differences.

TABLE 4

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Pretest, Posttest and Change Scores within Each Behavior Category

Inappropriate Aggressive Behaviors

	Pretest		Posttest		Change Scores	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Modeling with Principles	0.8	0.60	4.9	2.02	4.1	2.16
Modeling	1.7	1.35	4.4	2.87	2.7	2.69
Principles	1.8	1.17	3.4	1.99	1.6	1.86
Control	1.8	1.11	1.6	1.43	0.2	1.37

Inappropriate Nonaggressive Behaviors

	Pretest		Posttest		Change Scores	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Modeling with Principles	1.6	1.36	5.4	2.15	3.8	2.50
Modeling	2.1	1.92	5.1	2.54	3.0	1.70
Principles	2.8	1.93	5.0	1.73	2.2	1.55
Control	1.9	0.70	2.1	1.37	0.2	1.40

TABLE 4
(cont.)

Appropriate Behaviors

	Pretest		Posttest		Change Scores	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Modeling with Principles	6.5	1.43	8.0	0.40	1.5	1.28
Modeling	8.6	0.66	8.8	0.04	0.2	0.04
Principles	7.5	1.96	8.0	1.61	0.5	0.67
Control	8.8	0.04	9.0	0.00	0.2	0.04

Inappropriate Nonaggressive

The analysis of correct responses to the inappropriate nonaggressive behavior sequences revealed that the pretest to posttest changes in the number of correct responses (saying "That's not nice" and walking away) were significant [$F(3,35)=4.78$] at the 0.01 level of significance. Thus treatment procedures were effective in producing changes in the responses to the inappropriate but nonaggressive behaviors.

A Newman-Keuls *post hoc* statistic was then performed on adjusted mean scores to determine the differential effectiveness of each treatment procedure on changes in the number correct for these behavior sequences (see Table 5). The Modeling with Principles Group, the Modeling Group and the Principles Group each differed significantly from the No-Treatment Control Group but did not differ from each

other. At the 0.01 level of confidence, only the Modeling and the Modeling with Principles groups differed from the Control Group.

TABLE 5

Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis for Inappropriate Nonaggressive Sequences

Groups:	Control	Prin.	Model.	Model-prin.	r	Critical Values	
Means:	-0.28	1.96	3.00	3.09		.05	.01
	-	2.24*	3.28**	3.37**	4	2.71	3.37
	-	-	1.04	1.13	3	2.46	3.13
	-	-	-	0.09	2	2.04	2.74
	-	-	-	-			

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$

For the inappropriate nonaggressive behavior sequences, three response classes were designated as incorrect: (a) telling the teacher, (b) hitting and (c) smiling and being friendly. A significant increase in the number of correct responses (saying "That's not nice" and walking away) had to be accompanied by decreases in one or more of the incorrect response classes. To determine the extent to which decreases in the three incorrect response classes contributed to the increase in correct responses to these sequences of behavior, analyses were performed on each class of incorrect responses. The results of these

analyses were not significant. Changes in the number of correct responses to the inappropriate nonaggressive sequences could not be accounted for by significant changes in any one incorrect response class.

Inappropriate Aggressive

The analysis of correct responses to the inappropriate aggressive behavior sequences revealed that pretest to posttest changes in the number of correct responses (saying "That's not nice" and walking away) were significant [$F(3,35)=5.33$, $p<0.01$]. Thus treatment procedures were effective in producing changes in the responses to this category of behaviors.

In order to assess the differential effectiveness of each treatment procedure, a Newman-Keuls post hoc statistic was performed on adjusted mean change scores. Table 6 shows the results of this analysis. At the 0.05 level of confidence, the Modeling with Principles Group and the Modeling Group each differed significantly from the No-Treatment Control Group but did not differ from each other or from the Principles Group. At the 0.01 level of confidence, only the Modeling with Principles Group differed from the No-Treatment Control Group. The Principles treatment procedure did not significantly effect responses to the inappropriate aggressive behaviors as compared to the No-Treatment Control Group.

TABLE 6

Newman-Keuls Post Hoc Analysis for Inappropriate Aggressive Sequences

Groups:	Control	Prin.	Model.	Model-Prin.	r	Critical Value .05	Critical Value .01
Means:	0.12	1.96	2.82	3.79			
	-	1.84	2.70*	3.67**	4	2.56	3.18
	-	-	0.86	1.83	3	2.32	2.95
	-	-	-	0.97	2	1.93	2.59
	-	-	-	-			

*p<.05
**p<.01

For the inappropriate aggressive sequences of behavior, three response classes were designated as incorrect: (a) telling the teacher, (b) hitting and (c) smiling and being friendly. Analyses of covariance were performed on the incorrect response classes to determine the extent to which decreases in the incorrect response classes contributed to the increase in the correct responses to this category. The results of these analyses were not significant. Changes in the number of correct responses (Saying "That's not nice" and walking away) to the inappropriate aggressive sequences could not be accounted for by significant changes in any one incorrect response class.

Appropriate

The results of the analysis of correct responses to appropriate sequences revealed that pretest to posttest

changes in the number of correct responses (smiling and being friendly) were not significant [$F(3,35)=1.52$, $p>0.10$]. No analyses were performed on the incorrect response classes since there was no significant increase in the number of correct responses for this category.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Previous investigations, using peers as agents for behavior change, have focused primarily on a specific target behavior of a particular child. The principles behind behavior change were not emphasized. The present study expands the use of peers as "natural therapists" both by teaching principles of behavior change and by assessing the differential effectiveness of various training techniques for teaching behavior principles to four- and five-year-olds.

The results of this study indicate that all three of the training techniques were effective methods of teaching behavior principles to kindergarten children. None of the methods, however, differed from the others in effectiveness. However, when a stricter confidence level was used ($p<0.01$), only the Modeling and the Modeling with Principles groups differed significantly from the No-Treatment Control Group. This finding may have practical implications for teaching behavior principles to children in the natural environment. The finding that the two training procedures involving observation attained significance at the stricter

confidence level suggests that methods involving observation might result in more successful training.

Separate analyses performed on the responses to each of the three behavior categories suggest differential effectiveness for the three techniques. Responses to the appropriate category were not modified by any of the treatment procedures. Several alternative explanations may account for this finding. Mean pretest scores in this category ranged between 6.5 and 8.8 for all groups whereas mean pretest scores in both the inappropriate aggressive and the inappropriate nonaggressive categories fell below 3 for all groups. Therefore, the lack of significance in this category may be explained by the fact that Ss in this study approached a ceiling level on the pretest assessment. Further, this ceiling effect could be due to the type of early training children experience in both their home and school environments. Children are often reminded to say "please" and "thank you." However, children are rarely trained on what to do about inappropriate behavior. The possibility exists that even at this early age, children are already skilled at reinforcing appropriate behavior of others. Children are encouraged to consequate appropriate behaviors but are often not allowed to consequate inappropriate behaviors.

The analyses performed on responses to the inappropriate nonaggressive behavior sequences reflected

the overall results. All three treatment procedures were effective and no one procedure differed from any other. With a stricter confidence level, however, only the Modeling and the Modeling with Principles Groups differed significantly from the No-Treatment Control Group. Again, this may have practical implications for teaching behavior principles to children in the natural environment. The finding suggests that methods involving observation might result in more successful training when the behavior to be consequated is inappropriate but nonaggressive.

Analysis of responses to the inappropriate aggressive behavior sequences revealed that only the Modeling and the Modeling with Principles procedures were effective in increasing correct responses to this category of behavior. These two groups did not differ from each other in effectiveness. At a higher level of confidence ($p<0.01$), only the Modeling with Principles Group differed significantly from the No-Treatment Control Group. Therefore giving children training with only a verbal description of the appropriate behavior to use when a peer emits an aggressive response proved to be a less effective training procedure than modeling. Consistent with these data, one might assume that children do not possess the skills necessary for listening to rules and applying them to aggressive behaviors because children

have little experience in consequating aggression by other children. Children are taught that the aggressive actions of their peers are to be dealt with by an adult in the situation. Therefore, children may have to be shown the correct application of extinction before they are able to use this principle in modifying aggressive behavior of their peers. Verbal rules seem to be effective only when correct application of the rule is also observed.

Both the procedure and the results of the present study suggest new areas for further research. In this study, the method of assessment was a forced-choice procedure. The E provided the S with four responses from which the S chose the one most closely resembling what he would do in a similar situation. Subjects were required to choose one of the four responses and were not given the option of adding additional responses. Responses provided by the E were very concise and easily discriminated from each other. An alternative to the forced-choice procedure would be the free-recall procedure. In a free-recall testing situation, the E would present an open-ended question to the S, for example "what would you do if..." The S would then generate his own response with no limitations or cues provided by the E. Assessment may be less reliable in the recall procedure since the E must subjectively classify the S's responses. The S's task

after treatment is inherently different in the two procedures. The forced-choice procedure requires the S to recognize the correct response made while the free-recall procedure requires the S to recall the correct response class from memory. Further research might be aimed at comparing the two procedures.

A direct comparison of assessment techniques would be of interest to determine the relationship between responses emitted during the experimental situation and actual behaviors in the environment. Should either the forced-choice or the free-recall procedure be more consistent with actual behavior, both assessment and training should employ that procedure.

The present study has demonstrated that four- and five-year-old children can learn to apply the principle of verbal punishment followed by extinction to inappropriate aggressive behaviors and inappropriate but nonaggressive behaviors. All training techniques were effective in modifying responding within the experimental situation. However, research is still needed to determine the extent to which the different techniques are effective in producing generalization to the natural environment. One possible method of assessing generalization would be to observe Ss in the natural environment until an agreed upon number of appropriate, inappropriate aggressive and inappropriate but nonaggressive situations have been

observed. To reduce subjective evaluations, a strict criterion would be necessary for categorizing a S's responses in these situations. With this assessment technique, the amount of time required to observe the three types of situations may prove to be excessive. An alternative method would be to set up contrived situations using other children as confederates. Children employed in the present study in the testing sequences and during the modeling sequences were excellent confederates. Although observation in the natural environment may be a more powerful test of generalization of treatment techniques, a contrived situation offers several advantages. For example, with a contrived situation, the amount of time necessary for the testing of generalization would be reduced. Also, because the situations are planned and rehearsed prior to the actual testing, there is less need to subjectively categorize the situations. Even with a contrived assessment situation, however, the S's response must be subjectively evaluated.

Another area of concern for future research would be the effectiveness of the treatment procedures at different developmental stages. What is required of the S in each treatment procedure is inherently different. Subjects in the Principles Group were given rules and were then required to apply the rules to actual behavior. Subjects in the Modeling Group observed multiple samples of behaviors

representing the rules. This procedure required the Ss to abstract the rules and then apply them to a different set of behaviors. Subjects in the Modeling with Principles Group were given the rules and then shown examples of correct application of the rules. The data from this study suggest that it is easier for children, ages four and five, to abstract the rules from observed behavior than to apply stated rules. Differences in cognitive development, however, may influence the differential effectiveness of the treatment procedures. Thus with older children and adults, rules might be an equally effective training procedure.

The present study can be seen as one step in the more effective use of children as "natural therapists" for other children. The study demonstrated that children can learn the principles behind behavior change. An effective technique to treat children who are emitting maladaptive behaviors (e.g., talking out in class) might be to employ procedures similar to those of the present study. Once the children have learned the behavior principles, the teacher would then only have to identify for the class the appropriate and inappropriate behaviors of the child in question. One might also investigate the use of this procedure in combination with reinforcement for correct application of the principles and with reinforcement for reduction in the maladaptive behavior of the child.

Finally, the fact that children as young as four and five years old can learn to apply behavior principles has implications for ethical training. Children can learn to consequate inappropriate as well as appropriate behaviors. Teaching children to apply correct contingencies to both appropriate and inappropriate behaviors would give children a powerful means of manipulating the environments in which they live.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

Modeling, verbal training, and a combination of modeling and verbal training were compared to a no-treatment control group to determine which method was most effective in teaching behavior principles to kindergarten children. The principles taught were verbal punishment followed by extinction for inappropriate aggressive behaviors and inappropriate nonaggressive behaviors and reinforcement for appropriate behaviors. Subjects were four- and five-year-old kindergarten children.

The results of this study indicated that all three of the training techniques were effective methods of teaching the principles to kindergarten children. The methods, however, did not differ from one another in effectiveness. Separate analyses performed on the responses to each of three behavior categories suggested differential effectiveness for the three techniques. Responses to the appropriate category were not modified by any of the treatment procedures. Lack of significance in this category may be accounted for by the fact that subjects in this study approached a ceiling effect on the pretest assessment. The analysis performed on responses to the

inappropriate nonaggressive behavior sequences reflected the overall results: all three treatment procedures were effective in increasing the number of correct responses to these sequences and not one procedure differed from any other in its effectiveness. Only the modeling and the combination of modeling and verbal training were effective in modifying responses to the inappropriate aggressive behavior sequences. Implications of these results were discussed in terms of utilizing peers as "therapists" for a child's problem behavior in a group setting. In addition, areas of concern for future research were discussed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barrish, Harriet H., Saunders, Muriel and Wolf, Montrose M. Good behavior game: effects of individual contingencies for group consequences on disruptive behavior in a classroom. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1969, 2, 119-124.

Carlson, Constance S., Arnold, Carole R., Becker, Wesley C., and Madsen, Charles H. The elimination of tantrum behavior of a child in an elementary classroom. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1968, 6, 117-119.

Evans, Gary W. and Oswalt, Gaylon L. Acceleration of academic progress through the manipulation of peer influence. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1968, 6, 189-195.

Hall, R. Vance, Axelrod, Saul, Tyler, Lucille, Grief, Ellen, Jones, Fowler D., and Robertson, Roberta. Modification of behavior problems in the home with a parent as observer and experimenter. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1972, 5, 53-64.

Hall, R. Vance, Panyal, Marion, Rabon, Deloris and Broden, Marcia. Instructing beginning teachers in reinforcement procedures which improve classroom control. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1968, 1, 315-322.

Hall, R. V., Fox, R., Willard, D., Goldsmith, L., Emerson, M., Owen, M., Davis, R., and Porcia, E. The teacher as observer and experimenter in the modification of disputing and talking out behaviors. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1971, 4, 141-149.

Hawkins, Robert P., Peterson, Robert F., Schweid, Ed and Bijou, Sidney W. Behavior therapy in the home: amelioration of problem parent-child relations with the parent in a therapeutic role. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1966, 4, 99-107.

Surratt, Paul R., Ulrich, Roger E., and Hawkins, Robert P. An Elementary student as a behavioral engineer. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1969, 2, 85-92.

Wahler, Robert G., Winkel, Gary W., Peterson, Robert F. and Morrison, Delmont C. Mothers as behavior therapists for their own children. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1965, 3, 113-124.

Whalen, Carol K. and Henker, Barbara A. Creating therapeutic pyramids using mentally retarded patients. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1969, 3, 331-337.

Zeilberger, Jane, Sampen, Sue E. and Sloane, Howard N., Jr. Modification of a child's problem behaviors in the home with the mother as therapist. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1968, 1, 47-53.

APPENDIX A

TWENTY-SEVEN VIDEO-TAPED SEQUENCES OF BEHAVIOR WITH THEIR BEHAVIOR CATEGORIES

Behavior Sequences	Behavior Categories
1. A boy is reading a book; a second boy walks up and says: "What ya doing?"; the boy reading the book says: "None of your business	Inappropriate nonaggressive
2. A boy hits another boy over the head with a wooden block	Inappropriate aggressive
3. A boy opens the door for another boy whose hands are full of books.	Appropriate
4. A boy throws some plastic chips into the face of another boy	Inappropriate aggressive
5. A boy pulls a girl's hair	Inappropriate aggressive
6. A boy says to a girl: "Your shirt is ugly"	Inappropriate nonaggressive
7. A boy walks up behind another boy and scares him by saying "Boo"	Inappropriate nonaggressive
8. A boy says to another boy: "Here's a good book for you to look at"	Appropriate
9. A girl hits another girl on the head with a cardboard clock	Inappropriate aggressive
10. A boy says to a girl: "You have a pretty shirt on"	Appropriate
11. A girl messes up another girl's hair	Inappropriate nonaggressive
12. A girl says to another girl: "My shirt's prettier than yours"	Inappropriate nonaggressive
13. A boy chants to another boy: "You are a sissy, You are a sissy"	Inappropriate nonaggressive

	Behavior Sequences	Behavior Categories
14.	A girl says to another girl: "You are stupid"	Inappropriate nonaggressive
15.	A girl bites a boy on the arm	Inappropriate aggressive
16.	A girl says to a boy: "You're crazy"	Inappropriate nonaggressive
17.	A boy asks another boy: "Would you like to play with these blocks?"	Appropriate
18.	A boy says to a girl: "Can I please look at that?"	Appropriate
19.	A boy is taking his coat off. A girl helps him get it off.	Appropriate
20.	A boy pushes a girl off of the block she is sitting on	Inappropriate aggressive
21.	A boy says to a girl: "Your hair looks ugly"	Inappropriate nonaggressive
22.	A girl knocks over a block tower that a boy has just built	Inappropriate nonaggressive
23.	A boy picks up a pencil that a girl has dropped	Appropriate
24.	A boy looks at a girl through a magnifying glass and tells her she looks pretty	Appropriate
25.	A girl kicks a boy	Inappropriate aggressive
26.	A girl offers to brush another girl's hair	Appropriate
27.	A girl tells a boy that his shoes are old and dirty	Inappropriate nonaggressive

APPENDIX B

RESPONSE CHOICES PRESENTED TO THE SUBJECT AFTER EACH BEHAVIOR SEQUENCE

TELLING THE TEACHER

SAYING "THAT'S NOT NICE" AND WALKING AWAY

HITTING

SMILING AND BEING FRIENDLY

APPENDIX C

PRINCIPLES DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE PUPPET AND THE ADULT

Puppet: Hello!

Adult: Hi!

Puppet: My name is Elbert the Elephant. I am five years old and I am very smart for a five-year-old. I know lots and lots of rules.

Adult: O.K. If you're so smart, what's one hundred and one hundred?

Puppet: I'm not talking about arithmetic or spelling or reading. Anybody can learn that. I'm smart because I am only five years old and I already know how to do nice things for other children in the kindergarten. And I know what to do so that they will be nice and do nice things for me too. There is a very simple rule that I learned. Would you like to hear it?

Adult: Yes

Puppet: I will tell you the rule. If somebody does something you like, something you would like them to do again, then you should be very nice to them right after they have done it. This shows them that you are glad that they did what they did. Do you understand the rule?

Adult: I think so. You mean, if somebody does something nice and I show them or tell them that I like it when they do that, then they will do it again?

Puppet: Good! That's right. Let me tell you what happened to me when we were playing outside. Susie came over and told me that she liked the way I could throw a ball. That was very nice of her. I told her thank you and told her that I would show her how. We play together a lot and I show her how to do other things and she shows me how to do some things that she can do well too.

Adult: I see. Because you payed attention to Susie when she said something nice by saying Thank You and helping her, that you both play together and do other nice things for each other.

Puppet: Right. That's right. I will give you another example. It was raining. We were playing inside because it was raining outside. I wanted to play with a truck but there wasn't a truck left for me to play with. David came over to me and said, "You can share my truck with me." I told him how nice it was for him to share with me and we played together til lunch. I share lots of my toys with David and we have fun together.

Adult: Let me see if I understand. This time, you told David that you thought it was nice of him to share and you played together with the truck. Now you like to share things with each other. Right?

Puppet: Right.

Adult: That's a very interesting rule. I used your rule and I didn't even know it. My friend Tom brought me some water because I was hot from playing ball. I told him Thank You and that the water tasted good. I told him he was a good friend for bringing me some water. Now he does lots of nice things for me and I like to do nice things for him too.

Puppet: You know, I think you understand that rule. Repeat the whole rule while I listen.

Adult: The rule is: When somebody does something you wish they would do again, then you should be nice to them, talk to them, pay attention to them right after they did it to show them that you are glad they did what they did.

Puppet: That's very, very good. You have the rule exactly right.

Adult: But what happens when somebody says or does something you don't like and don't want them to do again?

Puppet: That's a good question, you know. I am only five years old and I am very smart. I know another rule. This rule says what to do when somebody does domething I wish they wouldn't do again. Would you like to hear rule number two?

Adult: Oh Yes.

Puppet: O.K. Here it goes. When somebody does something that you wish they wouldn't do again, then you tell them that you didn't like that and then you walk away from them - don't talk to them and don't pay any attention to them. This tells them that you don't like to play with them and that they are saying things that aren't nice.
One day during lunch, Tommy (he's another boy in the kindergarten) turned around to me and said, "I hate you." Do you know what I did?

Adult: No

Puppet: I said to him, "That's not nice" and turned around and didn't talk to him. I talked to another friend. Tommy and I are better friends and he hardly says mean things any more, and yesterday he told me that he likes me.

Adult: You mean you didn't talk to him ever again?

Puppet: No. I just wanted to show him that I didn't want to talk to him if he said mean things. When he was nice again, I talked to him.

Adult: When someone says something mean to me then I tell them that I don't like that and I walk away from them and don't talk to them for a little while until they are nice again.

Puppet: Here is another example of the same rule. Debby is a friend of mine. Debby and I were looking at books at a table in the kindergarten and Debby reached over and pinched me for no reason at all. Instead of getting angry and pinching or hitting her, I told her that it is not nice to hurt people and I went to another table to read my book alone. Debby hardly ever pinches anybody any more.

Adult: The same thing happened to me the other day and I used your rule. My friend pinched me on the arm and I told him that I didn't like him to hurt me and I started talking to another friend. I didn't pay any attention to the friend who pinched me. He doesn't pinch me any more.

Puppet: That's right. That's rule number two. Now tell me rule number two while I listen so I will be sure you understand rule number two.

Adult: The rule is: If somebody does something you don't like, tell them that it is not nice and walk away, don't talk to them and don't pay any attention to them. That shows them that you won't play with them if they say or do mean things.

Puppet: Good. Very, very good. Now you know two very good rules that will tell you what to do when somebody does something that you don't like and when they do something that you do like. Remember rule number one?

Adult: I think so

Puppet: If someone does something you like, something you would like them to do again, then you should be very, very nice to them right after they have done it. This shows them that you are glad that they did what they did.
And rule number two. When someone does something that you don't want them to do again, then tell them that you didn't like that and walk away from them, don't talk to them and don't pay any attention to them for a little while to show them that you will not play with them when they are saying or doing mean things.

Adult: Those are two very good rules that I will remember. You are a very smart person.

Puppet: I know. I know I am very smart and I am only five years old.

APPENDIX D

THIRTY VIDEO-TAPED SEQUENCES OF BEHAVIOR WITH MODELED CONSEQUENCES

	Behavior Sequences	Modeled Consequences
1.	A boy purposively steps on a girl's foot	The girl says: "Don't do that" and walks away
2.	A girl is playing a xylophone. Another girl says: "That sounds terrible"	The girl says: "That's not nice" and walks away
3.	A boy trips over another boy's foot and says: "I'm sorry"	The second boy says: "That's O.K., it was an accident"
4.	A boy says to another boy: "This is my new truck and you can't play with it"	The second boy says: "It's nicer to share" and walks away
5.	A girl tells a second girl that the second girl draws well	The second girl says: "Thank you, I'll show you how"
6.	A boy jerks another boy's shoe off	The second boy says: "That's not nice" and walks away
7.	A girl tells another girl that she is not her friend	The second girl says: "I don't care" and walks away
8.	A boy tells another boy that he doesn't like him	The second boy says: "I like everybody" and walks away
9.	A boy says: "I wish I could build a bridge." Another boy shows him how	The first boy says: "Thank you"
10.	A teacher tells a boy to stack up the blocks. A second boy offers to help the boy pick up the blocks	The first boy says: "Thank you"

	Behavior Sequences	Modeled Consequences
11.	A boy tells a girl that girls aren't supposed to play with trucks	The girl says: "That's not true" and begins to play with the truck
12.	One boy rams his truck into another boy's truck	The second boy says: "I wish you wouldn't do that" and takes his truck and leaves
13.	A boy scribbles on a girl's picture as he tells her he doesn't like it	The girl says: "That's not nice," takes paper and pencil, turns away from the boy and continues drawing
14.	A girl tells another girl that her mother is fat	The second girl says: "She's a good mother and walks away
15.	A boy is drawing. A second boy walks up and the first boy gives him a piece of paper and a pencil to draw with	The second boy says: "Thank you, you're my friend
16.	A girl bumps into a boy as she sits down and says: "Excuse me"	The boy says: "That's O.K., I'll move over
17.	A boy tells a girl he likes her	The girl tells the boy that she likes him too and they play together
18.	A boy tells a girl that he will spin her in her chair	The girl says: "Thank you" and offers to spin him also
19.	A girl tells a boy that his block tower is a bad tower	The boy says that he thinks it is a good tower and turns away from her
20.	A boy pulls a girl out of her seat and she drops what she is looking at	The girl says: "I could get hurt" and walks away

Behavior Sequences	Modeled Consequences
21. A girl is trying to get up onto a walkway she made out of blocks and says: "I can't get up"	A boy helps her up and she says: "Thank you"
22. A girl shakes a boy by the shoulder as she calls him a silly boy	The boy says: "I don't like that" and walks away
23. A boy hooks a girl's arm with an umbrella and pulls her over	The girl tells him that it hurt and walks away
24. A girl walks up to a boy who is playing and says: "I want to play with that right now"	The boy ignores the comment and tells her that they can play together
25. A girl takes a truck away from a boy and begins to play with it	The boy says: "It's not nice to take things," takes back the truck and walks away
26. A boy jumps on top of another boy who is lying on the floor	The second boy says: "That's not nice" and leaves
27. A girl says to another girl: "Let's switch toys"	The second girl says: "O.K., I like to share toys"
28. A girl is on her knees. Another girl pushes her and the first girl falls over	The first girl says: "That hurt" and walks away
29. A boy hits a girl on the head	The girl says: "That hurt" and walks away
30. A girl is looking at a book. Another girl says to her: "You can't read"	The first girl says: "I'm looking at the pictures" and turns away from the other girl while continuing to look at the book

APPENDIX E

IRRELEVANT DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE PUPPET AND THE ADULT

Puppet: Hi!

Adult: Hi!

Puppet: Know what my name is?

Adult: No, what?

Puppet: My name is Elbert the Elephant and I am five years old and I am a very nice elephant. Know why? Because I am smart and I like to read and I like to write and I like to do arithmetic and I am very handsome.

Adult: Yes, you are handsome. Do you have any friends?

Puppet: Yes. Because I am handsome, everybody wants to be my friend. I have friends whose names are Debby, David and a girlfriend. Do you want to know about my girlfriend?

Adult: Tell me about her.

Puppet: I'm shy.

Adult: Oh come on.

Puppet: Her name is Elli the Elephant, and I'm Elbert, and people call us Elli and Elbert, the cute, pretty and handsome elephants. I have cute eyes and cute tusks. Want to feel them?

Adult: They are pretty. And your nose is nice.

Puppet: Yes, I have a beautiful nose and see my hat, look at the shape on the top.

Adult: What shape is it?

Puppet: It's a diamond.
Well, we're in the kindergarten and I have loads of friends - David, Debby, Elli and I are in the kindergarten. David and Elli are great and wonderful people and they do lots of nice things. They play with me. We play blocks and we have lots of fun together. We talk and play games. Our teacher loves us because we do nice things. We are very friendly.

Adult: I have friends. We play games and we play nicely together.

Puppet: I have some mean friends. I want to tell you about my friend Kevin. One day I was in the kindergarten and Kevin came over while I was painting a nice, nice picture. It was pretty. Kevin took the paint and poured it on my head.

Adult: Oh no.

Puppet: Yes, he took that jar of paint and poured it all over me and the teacher had to wipe all the paint off of me. I didn't like that.

Adult: I have mean friends too. I have one friend named Joe and he slapped me the other day and I didn't do anything.

Puppet: You're kidding.

Adult: No and nobody likes to be hurt. You didn't like it when Kevin poured paint all over you.

Puppet: I hated it and I bet you didn't like being slapped.

Adult: No and we didn't do anything to deserve it, did we?

Puppet: No, people do those things and I just don't know why.

Adult: I don't understand it either.

Puppet: Us nice people have to stick together. Are you a nice person?

Adult: Yes and I went to the circus with another nice person last week.

Puppet: You went to the circus?

Adult: And I saw a lot of your friends - lots of elephants. I bet I saw Elli.

Puppet: You saw Elli? She said she was there.

Adult: Yes and you're right. She's really pretty.

Puppet: I'm so shy. She is so cute, my girl friend Elli. She's the best-est girl in the whole wide world. She's just a lot of fun.

Adult: I saw your friend David. He was there. There were lots of elephants. I bet you knew most of them.

Puppet: Do you want me to tell you something that is a secret?
(Whispers) Let me tell you this - I was at the circus too.

Adult: I didn't see you. Where were you?

Puppet: I was in the elephant show. Didn't you see me in the center ring?

Adult: Oh yes.

Puppet: And all those people were behind me.

Adult: You were just wonderful. I bet you do lots of elephant shows because you are a nice person.

Puppet: I am nice and you are nice so let's kiss because we are both nice.